UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/585,482	07/10/2006	Shinji Kajita	2006_1016A	7917
	7590 04/30/200 , LIND & PONACK, I	EXAMINER		
1030 15th Stree Suite 400 East		BLAN, NICOLE R		
Washington, DC 20005-1503			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1792	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/30/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/585,482	KAJITA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
	I	1

	NICOLE BLAN	1792	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>22 April 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth inter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing to). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE). On which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount of the characteristic for reply original contends the corresponding amount of the corresp	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII 36(a) and the appropriate of the fee. The appropriate analy set in the final Office	e extension fee ate extension; or (2) as
may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ulan unee monuis alter the mailing dat	e or the imarrejection, e	ven ii uineiy illeu,
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. ☑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a)☑ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	isideration and/or search (see NOT	will <u>not</u> be entered be E below);	cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying tl	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c		ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	* **		OTOL 224)
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		npliant Amendment (-10L-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all- non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1,3,8,9,11,12,21,22,30,36 and 37. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Michael Cleveland/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1792			
The state of the s			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed After Final amendments will not be entered because they raise new issues that require further search and consideration. The issues that require further search and consideration are the newly added limitations in claims 3 and 9.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments regarding the newly added limitations of claim 9 are unconvincing because they are directed to the proposed new limitations, and the proposed amendments have not been entered.

In response to applicant's arguments regarding the rejection of claim 3 failing to teach the claimed limitations, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Regarding the limitation of the second nozzle supplying a second liquid to an inner surface of the holder and an upper surface of the base member, the Examiner would like to draw the applicant's attention to Figure 6. Figure 6 illustrates the fluid pathway (628) that flows up to holder (648). The wafer (606) rests on the clamps, and the liquid that is supplied through 628 does in fact supply liquid to the inner surface of the holder (648). Additionally, the liquid will then contact an upper surface of the base member (the part that is parallel to the tranducer (608) to the bottom of it). Therefore, '475 does in fact the claimed limitation. Regarding the limitations drawn to the discharge mechanism, the Examiner does not find this persuasive. This recitation is a statement of intended use which does not patentably distinguish over the prior art of recorded since '075 meets all the structural elecments of the claim(s) and is capable of discharging a liquid without supplying liquid to the substrate if so desired. See MPEP 2114. Furthermore, claims directed to an apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. In re Danly, 263 F.2d 844, 847, 120 USPQ@ 528, 531 (CCPA 1959). "[A]pparatus claims cover what a device is, not what a device does." Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc., 909 F.2d 1464, 1469, 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990).